

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/756,123	01/12/2004	Ralf Gutsche	HSJ920030256US1	3143
John I Pogitz	7590 01/23/2008		EXAM	INER
John L. Rogitz Rogitz & Associates			LU, KUEN S	
Suite 3120 750 B Street			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
San Diego, CA 92101			2167	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/23/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/756,123	GUTSCHE, RALF				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Kuen S. Lu	2167				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timulated and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	I. lely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>05 Jules</u> This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This Since this application is in condition for allowant closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro					
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) 7-9 is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the or	r election requirement. r. epted or b)□ objected to by the E					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex-	ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:					

Application/Control Number: 10/756,123 Page 2

Art Unit: 2167

DETAILED ACTION

Reopened Prosecution

- 1. The Action is responsive to Applicant's Appeal Brief filed June 5, 2007. Regretted is this examination has been delayed due to internal transfers of the application.
- 2. Applicant's Arguments/Remarks filed June 5, 2007, have been fully considered but they are most on new grounds of rejection.
- **3.** Please note claims 1-9 in the application have been examined, in which claims 1-6 are rejected and claims 7-9 are objected, and claims 1-9 remain pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- **4.** The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4.1. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over by Killian et al. (U.S. Patent 6,760,888, issued 7/6/2004, hereafter "Killian") in view of Claussen et al. (U.S. Patent 7,266,766, issued 9/4/2007, hereafter "Claussen").

Application/Control Number: 10/756,123

Art Unit: 2167

As per claim 1, Killian teaches "A graphical user interface (GUI) for configuring pipelines, the GUI displayable on a user computer monitor and comprising" (See col. 10, lines 64-66 where GUI is provided by using a browser with data input screens written in JAVA):

"at least one pipe input set window configured to permit a user to define a type of pipe input set data" (See col. 31, line 50 – col. 32, line 4 where an instruction set simulator is a data pipeline configured based on well-defined sources and the simulator derives its behavior based on ISA files used to define corresponding system software and hardware).

Killian does not explicitly teach "at least one GUI page based on the type, the GUI page being generated by translating the type using a configuration file to a class and using Java reflection to generate an instance of the class, the instance producing the GUI page".

However, Claussen teaches "at least one GUI page based on the type, the GUI page being generated by translating the type using a configuration file to a class and using Java reflection to generate an instance of the class, the instance producing the GUI page" (See col. 28, lines 28-38 where a markup tag is defined and converted into script code, based on Java object or XSL style-sheet, and compiled into Java code and servelet).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention was made to combine the teaching of Clausen with Killian reference by establishing and conducting pipeline test for code generation to handle

runtime request for Claussen's system because both references are directed to optimize software tool performance (See Killian: col. 6, lines 44-51 and Claussen: col. 2, lines 58-60) and the combined teaching would have expedited and better debugged Claussen's process series of script code generation, conversion and compilation.

The combined teaching of the Claussen and Killian references further teaches "using the GUI page to configure a data pipeline" (See Claussen: col. 28, lines 28-38 where a web page is converted, and Killian: col. 10, lines 64-66 where GUI is provided by using a browser with data input screens written in JAVA).

As per claim 2, Killian teaches "The GUI of claim 1, wherein at least the pipe input set window and GUI page require no programming apart from an initial core code" (See Killian: col. 5, lines 57-64 where pipeline stages used for instruction execution is fixed when there is no new instruction or instruction change).

As per claim 3, Killian teaches "The GUI of claim 1, wherein the GUI is an incremental GUI wherein GUI pages for new pipe components can be added incrementally without changing existing code" (See col. 31, line 65 - col. 32, line 4 where cache and pipeline models are configured before the instruction set simulator is compiled).

As per claim 4, Killian teaches "The GUI of claim 3, wherein at least one new pipe module is based on a pre-existing module type" (See col. 31, line 50 – col. 32, line 4

Application/Control Number: 10/756,123 Page 5

Art Unit: 2167

where an instruction set simulator is a data pipeline configured based on well-defined sources and the simulator derives its behavior based on ISA files).

As per claim 5, Killian teaches "The GUI of claim 3, wherein at least one new pipe module is based on a new user-defined component type" (See col. 31, line 50 – col. 32, line 4 where an instruction set simulator is a data pipeline configured based on well-defined sources and the simulator derives its behavior based on ISA files).

As per claim 6, Allen teaches "The GUI of claim 1, wherein the GUI defines a set of interfaces, each interface including plural functions, the GUI including a GUI representation part and a storage part, the GUI representation part defining how something is displayed and the storage part defining how GUI parameters are stored in an external storage" (See Fig. 4 and col. 11, lines 19-32 where a processor configuration editor in the GUI displayed how components are displayed and GUI parameters displayed on the GUI includes cache and various memory).

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 7, 8 and 9 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten to overcome if any rejections(s) under 35 U.S.C. § 101 and 35 U.S.C. § 112, and in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

References

6. The prior art made of record

Application/Control Number: 10/756,123 Page 6

Art Unit: 2167

A. U.S. Patent No. 6,760,888

B. U.S. Patent No. 7,266,766

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- C. U.S. Patent Application 2004/0117427
- D. U.S. Patent Application 2004/0015852
- E. U.S. Patent No. 7,224,373
- F. U.S. Patent Application 2004/0015832

Contact Information

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Kuen S. Lu whose telephone number is (571)-272-4114. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00 am-5:00 pm). If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone pre unsuccessful, the examiner's Supervisor, John Cottingham can be reached on (571)-272-7079. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for Page 13 published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

Art Unit: 2167

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-27-9197 (toll free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, please call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Kuen S. Lu,

Primary Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2167

January 19, 2008